252248.1

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Page 1 of 4

Case 2:11-cv-01215-JCM-NJ	Concument 22	Filed 05/15/12	Page 2 of 4
---------------------------	--------------	----------------	-------------

DATED this ______ day of April, 2012.

WILSON, ELSER, MOSKOWITZ, EDELMAN & DICKER ILP

BY:

Kym Samuel Cushing Esq. Nevada Bar No. 004242

Paul J. Hofmann, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 10369

300 South Fourth Street, 11th Floor

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Attorneys for Defendant Target Corporation

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. FACTUAL SUMMARY

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2.7

28

This matter stems from an incident that took place on or about September 28, 2009 at a Target Store in Las Vegas, Nevada. The plaintiff alleges that she arrived at the Target located at 3210 N. Tenaya Way, Las Vegas, Nevada, on September 28, 2009. The claimant alleges that she walked to the Home Improvement section of the store to purchase a mop hanger. As she was pulling the hanger off the display, a wire rack, that was for sale, slid off the display and landed on her foot. She is claiming to have suffered a compression of a nerve in her foot which has resulted in a wage loss and medical bills.

Specifically, the plaintiff is claiming because of Defendant's negligence, she required medical treatment and surgery. She further alleges injuries that have resulted in pain, suffering, impairment, disability in excess of \$50,000.00. Plaintiff is also claiming loss of income and emotional distress.

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed her Complaint on April 19, 2011 in the 8th Judicial District Court, Clark County Nevada. On July 27, 2011, Defendant removed this matter to United States District Court for the District of Nevada. On August 29, 2011, a Stipulated Discovery Plan and scheduling Order were filed. The plan was granted on September 2, 2011. On October 24, 2011, Target propounded a First Set of Interrogatories, a First Request for Production, and a First Request for Admissions on Plaintiff. Plaintiff did not timely respond to all written discovery, and Defendant filed a Motion to

252248.1

Compel Discovery Response. On February 27, 2012, this court granted Defendant's Motion to Compel and granted sanctions against Plaintiff for late discovery responses.

Defendant now brings this motion for physical examination of Plaintiff pursuant to FFRCP 35, as the physical condition of Plaintiff is in controversy in this matter.

III. LEGAL ANALYSIS

FRCP 35(a) provides in pertinent part as follows:

- a) ORDER FOR AN EXAMINATION.
 - (1) In General. The court where the action is pending may order a party whose mental or physical condition—including blood group—is in controversy to submit to a physical or mental examination by a suitably licensed or certified examiner. The court has the same authority to order a party to produce for examination a person who is in its custody or under its legal control.
 - (2) Motion and Notice; Contents of the Order. The order:
 - (A) may be made only on motion for good cause and on notice to all parties and the person to be examined; and
 - (B) must specify the time, place, manner, conditions, and scope of the examination, as well as the person or persons who will perform it.

The physical condition of the plaintiff is in controversy. Here, Plaintiff is claiming (among other things) as a result of the alleged negligence of Defendant claiming to have suffered a compression of a nerve in her foot which has resulted in a wage loss and medical bills.

Dr. Hyson will take a complete physical and history from Plaintiff. In addition, Dr. Hyson, a neurologist, will perform a complete physical examination. Time permitting, Dr. Hyson will also perform nerve conduction studies.

Therefore, because plaintiff is alleging physical (neurological) impairments, there is good cause for Target Corporation to request that Plaintiff undergo an IME. Further, plaintiff has been provided with sufficient notice of the time, location, manner and scope of said examinations.

As a result, request is made that this honorable Court order plaintiff to appear for her scheduled IME on May 1, 2012.

252248.1

1	IV. CONCLUSION				
2	For the foregoing reasons, Defendant TARGET CORPORATION requests this honorable				
3	Court grant this motion and order plaintiff to appear for his scheduled IME on May 1, 2012.				
4	DATED this day of April, 2012.				
5	IT IS SO ORDERED. WILSON, ELSER, MOSKOWITZ, EDELMAN				
6	& DICKER LLP				
7	Colaton By:				
8	U.S. Magistrate Judge Kym Sarauel Cushing, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 004242				
9	Date: May 15, 2012 Paul J. Hofmann, Esq.				
10	Nevada Bar No. 10369 300 South Fourth Street, 11th Floor				
11	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Attorneys for Defendant Target Corporation				
12					
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE				
13	Pursuant to FRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of WILSON, ELSER				
14	MOSKOWITZ, EDELMAN & DICKER LLP and that on this 15 day of April, 2012				
15	electronically filed and served a true and correct copy of the foregoing DEFENDANT TARGET				
16	CORPORATION'S FRCP 35 MOTION FOR PHYSICAL EXAMINATION OF PLAINTIFI				
17	MARSHA ELLIOT ON AN ORDER SHORTENING TIME to all parties on file with the				
18	CM/ECF.				
19	Janet S. Markley, Esq.				
20	LAW OFFICE OF JANET S. MARKLEY 1000 Nevada Way, Suite 102 Boulder City, NV 89005				
21					
22	Phone 702.294.6529 FAX 702.446.8090				
23	Attorney for Plaintiff BY BY BY BY BY BY BY BY BY				
24					
25	An Employee of WILSON, ELSER, MOSKOWITZ, EDELMAN & DICKER LLP				
26					
27					

252248.1